

REMARKS

The Office Action rejects claims 1-10, 12, 13, 15-18 and 20-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,202,212 to Sturgeon et al. (hereafter Sturgeon) in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0024657 to Wright et al. (hereafter Wright). The rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a storing unit and a controlling unit to access information from the Internet site using the stored proper information of the TV in response to a user pressing a function selection key, the proper information of the TV and the contact information having been stored in the storing unit prior to the user pressing the function selection key, the controlling unit further displaying function information and feature information of the TV on a screen by using the stored contact information and the stored proper information.

The applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. More specifically, Sturgeon and Wright do not teach or suggest accessing information from an Internet site using stored proper information of a TV in response to a user pressing a function selection key. MPEP §2142 states that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Since Sturgeon and Wright, either alone or in combination, do not teach to access information from an Internet site using stored proper information of a TV in response to a user pressing a function selection key, the Office Action has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Sturgeon discloses a home theater computer system that may include a display unit 40 acting as a computer monitor in one mode or a television unit in another mode. The user may

switch between a TV mode or a PC mode. See col. 8, lines 26-67; and FIG. 6. However, Sturgeon has no suggestion for storing proper information of a TV and/or accessing information from an Internet site using stored proper information of the TV in response to a user pressing a function selection key. Rather, Sturgeon merely discloses the ability to switch modes of a display unit. The Office Action (on page 3) also states that Sturgeon does not explicitly disclose storing proper information of the TV and contact information of an Internet site.

The Office Action relies on Wright for the missing features of independent claim 1. However, Wright discloses a label 100 that may include an indicator (such as a URL) as well as product name, serial number and/or patent number. See FIG. 1 and paragraphs [0022]-[0023]. Wright discloses that a label may be included within a memory 200. The memory 200 may be accessed using a processor. See FIG. 2 and paragraphs [0025]-[0027]. However, this does not teach or suggest storing proper information of a TV. Wright does not relate to a television and therefore has no suggestion for storing proper information of the TV and/or accessing information using the stored proper information of the TV. Wright therefore does not teach or suggest the features of independent claim 1 missing from Sturgeon.

Accordingly, neither reference teaches accessing information from an Internet site using stored proper information of a TV in response to a user pressing a function selection key. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no suggestion to modify Sturgeon so as to include a TV that accesses the Internet and obtains proper information of the TV. The only suggestion for such features is provided in applicants' own specification. The Office Action therefore relies on

impermissible hindsight. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that Sturgeon and Wright do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 10 recites when a key selection is made by a user, transmitting stored proper information of the TV from the TV to a product-related site by using stored contact information of the product-related site stored in the TV in advance of the key selection by the user, wherein the proper information includes a model name or a model number of the TV.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 10. Further, the applied references do not teach or suggest transmitting stored proper information of a TV from the TV to a product-related site, wherein the proper information includes a model name or a model number of the TV.

Sturgeon and Wright do not relate to a model name and/or model number of a TV. At best, Wright merely discloses that a product name or serial number may be included on a label. However, this does not suggest a model name or model number of a TV in combination with the storing of this information (of the TV) and transmitting the information from the TV to a product-related site. Stated differently, there is no motivation in the prior art to modify Sturgeon's home theater computer system to include storing/transmitting a model name or model number of a TV. Accordingly, independent claim 10 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 20 recites transmitting previously-stored identifying information of a television system to a server in direct response to the received key signal, the identifying information having been stored in the television system prior to receiving the key signal.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 20. Further, Sturgeon and Wright do not teach or suggest transmitting previously-stored identifying information of a television system to a server in direct response to the received key signal. The Office Action (on page 9) appears to rely on Wright for these features. However, Wright clearly does not suggest a television system. Thus, Wright does not suggest transmitting information of a television system in direct response to a key signal. Wright's disclosure of a computer system does not correspond to a television system and/or to an operation being performed in direct response to a key signal in a television system. Accordingly, independent claim 20 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 10 and 20 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-10, 12-13, 15-18 and 20-26 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. 09/840,881

Docket No. P-0219

Reply to Office Action dated July 7, 2006

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and

please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren

Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200

703-766-3701 DCO/kah

Date: September 27, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610